

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the April 8, 2004 Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants amend the claims herein to correct any indefiniteness and Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,893,184 issued to Ishigami. The rejection asserts that Ishigami allegedly teaches each element of the claims. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishigami. The rejection asserts that Ishigami allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for the media being a disk cartridge, which would have allegedly been obvious to one of skill in the art. Claim 14 is canceled herein.

The claims are amended to be directed toward a removable media system including a drive having a stopper and a cartridge having a stop feature. The stop feature of the cartridge interfaces with the stopper to stop the ejecting cartridge at a predetermined ejection travel distance. None of the cited art teaches or suggests this unique combination. Ishigami shows a cartridge with depressions 4 that are used to hold the cartridge into the drive with interfacing with arms 5. This prevents the cartridge from being inadvertently ejected. However, Ishigami never teaches or suggests a drive having a stopper or any type of system which limits the distance the cartridge is to be ejected. The claims require the stop feature interface with a stopper to control the ejection distance of the cartridge. Only with reading the present application does one even get the idea to limit ejection distance, much less to use the depressions of Ishigami in that manner. Because the present application should not be used as a blueprint in analyzing prior art, that reading of Ishigami is improper. Further, none of the prior art shows the feature of a drive having a stopper.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 11 is patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 is in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claim 11.

Claims 12-13 and 15 depend either directly or indirectly from Independent Claim 11. Each dependent claim further defines independent Claim 11. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 12-13 and 15.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
Atty. Docket No. P0698-US

Serial No.: 09/841,718
Filed: April 25, 2001

Page 5 of 5

Summary

In view of the above amendments and remarks, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 7, 2004

By: 

James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631

IOMEGA CORPORATION
Patent Department
10955 Vista Sorrento Parkway
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 314-7152
Facsimile: (858) 314-7005